

directed to a network cryptographic security system that enforces cryptographic security policy in a public key crypto system. As noted in claim 1, the claim requires a mechanism that provides variable security policy rule data for distribution to at least one network node. Although the office action admits that Matyas does not teach or suggest variable security policy rule data, the office action nonetheless states that Mayas teaches “the variable policy rule data from the means for storing (see for example column 16, lines 10-25)” and “analyzing the variable policy rule data to facilitate unilateral security policy enforcement in a network node level (see for example column 9, lines 15-51)”. The office action states that “Matyas does not explicitly teach a variable security policy”. (Office action, page 11). Since it is admitted that Matyas does not teach such a system, Matyas cannot then be cited as teaching the storage means and the network node means that obtains the digital signature and variable policy rule data from the means for storing as claimed and as alleged in the office action. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Moreover, the office action does not appear to address what structure in Matyas corresponds to the claimed “means for providing variable security policy rule data for distribution to at least one network node” as required, for example, by claim 1 and for example noted in method claim 16. In fact, it appears that Matyas employs a static security policy technique wherein once a security policy has been determined, it is not changed and as noted in the cited portion of Matyas, column 16, lines 10-25, Matyas merely teaches that the network node can get a certificate issued if it sends the requisite information to a certificate authority. Applicants’ claim is directed to a completely different operation and structure. Matyas appears to teach hard coding security policy rules. In addition, as claimed, the variable policy rule data allows nodes to have their policy varied and the node can then pull periodically security policy

certificates or any other suitable form of security policy indication, to alter the security policy of a node and the node unilaterally enforces its own security policy. Such an approach does not appear to be contemplated by the cited references. Matyas teaches using an audit record and digital signature that are transmitted to a certification center in two messages and that the audit record contains a digital signature of the device or node requesting certificate. The node in Matyas does not periodically obtain a digital signature and variable policy rule data as alleged in the office action since there is no discussion in the cited portions of changing the security policy certificates and having the node pull that information for unilateral enforcement.

Moreover, the Barlow reference also does not appear to teach or contemplate the generation of, storing of, or retrieving of variable security policy rule data. The cited portion such as column 2, lines 18-21 of Barlow teaches the use of a “predefined security policy” and associating in “each message” a label denoting how to enforce the computer security policy with respect to the message. As such, each message contains data indicating how the message is to be treated based on a predefined security policy. This predefined policy does not appear to be varied by the system in Barlow. Moreover, the claims require that the variable rule policy data is not in the message as required by Barlow. Accordingly, Applicants claim an opposite approach and Barlow does not appear to contemplate or teach the claimed invention. Accordingly, the combination of these references also appear to fail to teach the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In addition, the claims require that the network node periodically obtain the variable policy rule data from, for example, a repository associated with a centralized variable policy rule data provider. Again, there is no need for such an operation in either Matyas or Barlow because Barlow includes the information in each message that is necessary and Matyas does not teach

periodically obtaining the variable policy rule data as required. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.


The office action also alleges that it is notoriously well known to obtain variable policy rule data from a source other than from a forwarded signed message. Applicants respectfully request factual support for such a statement since the office action appears to be overlooking specific claim language and teachings in the art. For example, as noted in Barlow, Barlow requires that each message include the level of security so there is no need to obtain anything. As such, Barlow appears to teach away from this alleged assertion. Moreover, the claim is specific to the type of information obtained and the office action again overlooks the specific claim language in this regard. Since neither of the references teach such an operation, Applicants respectfully submit that the references themselves appear to support Applicants' position. As such, the claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

As to the dependent claims, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with the independent claims. Accordingly, the dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. Moreover, the dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. Applicants also respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with respect to the independent claims as they are also applicable other independent claims such as independent claims 29 and 34 and as such, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/9/04

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
312-609-7599
312-609-5005 (Fax)